D:88076799

Kit _____ Box 2
Item 2-114
Carol _____

RIO PUERCO RMP 20TH YEAR

EVALUATION REPORT

July 25 - 28, 2006

Team Leader: _____ Date: _____
Prepared

Field Manager: _____ Date: _____
Concurrence

State Director: _____ Date: _____
Approval

Table of Contents

A. Introduction.....2

B. Purpose of Evaluation.....2

C. Approach.....3

D. Results and Findings.....4

E. Team Recommendations.....10

F. Summary Recommendations 13

Appendix A - Question and Response Summary.....15

RIO RUERCO RMP 20TH YEAR EVALUATION

A. Introduction

The Rio Puerco Resource Management Plan (RMP) Record of Decision (ROD) and Plan was signed in January 1986. Regulations found at title 43 Code of Federal Regulations (43 CFR) § 1610.4-9 require that land use planning establish intervals and standards for monitoring and evaluation and the Land Use Planning Handbook (1601-1) requires that the BLM's existing plans should be evaluated every five years. This is the fourth evaluation of the Rio Puerco RMP. The fifth year evaluation was completed in 1991 and the tenth year evaluation was completed in 1996. The 15th evaluation was completed in 2000. Those past evaluations are on file in the New Mexico State Office.

B. Purpose of Evaluation

The following evaluation is submitted in fulfillment of these requirements and those of the National Strategy Performance Measure 02.01.02.01. Since implementation of the Rio Puerco RMP began in 1986, the public has been kept informed of accomplishments and planned actions through use of annual updates. Where new resource planning issues have arisen that were not included in the original RMP, the plan was amended to keep it current. During the 20 years the plan has been used, it has been amended eight times. The Amendments include: an Oil and Gas leasing and development RMPA completed in January 1992; the Continental Divide National Scenic Trail RMPA completed in December 1992; the Ignacio Chavez RMPA addressing a seasonal road closure completed in May 1998; the Standards for Public Land Health and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management RMPA completed in April 2000; the RMPA for Riparian and Aquatic Management in the Albuquerque Field Office; and the statewide Fire and Fuels Management on Public Lands in New Mexico and Texas. The El Malpais NCA RMPA, a stand alone plan for the NCA within the planning area, was also a plan amendment to the Rio Puerco RMP and was completed in the spring of 2001.

Originally the Albuquerque FO proposed to revise or amend the RMP beginning in FY 2002. However, for a variety of reasons, that schedule has been delayed. Based on this evaluation, this RMP revision or amendment is now scheduled to begin in 2008. In FY (2006) the FO needs to identify issues to be addressed, determine if the plan should be an amendment to the existing plan or plan revision, determine additional information and data needs, and begin to gather assessment information and data. In addition Cooperating Agencies, partnerships, and public constituencies need to be identified to initiate the planning process through Scoping.

C. Approach

For its 20th year evaluation, the Rio Puerco RMP was evaluated by a team according to guidance in the Land Use Planning Handbook. The evaluation team included: Dwayne Sykes from the New Mexico State Office, Tom Phillips and Lori Allen from the Las Cruces DO, Mark Spencer from the WO Planning Group (WO210), and Maggie Langlas from the WO NLCS staff (WO 170). The evaluation team met at the Albuquerque DO July 25 to July 27 to conduct interviews with the staff. The evaluation team, along with other members of the Rio Puerco Resource Area staff, toured the Kasha Katuwe Tent Rocks National Monument on Tuesday El Malpais NCA on Wednesday. The purpose of the tours was to observe and evaluate on-going management activities of the NLCS units with respect to the decisions in the Rio Puerco RMP and the El Malpais RMP. The tours facilitated additional findings for the evaluation report.

Prior to the evaluation team's visit to the Albuquerque DO, a questionnaire was sent to all the resource specialists who work with or have knowledge of the RMP to help focus the evaluation. Responses were received from only 6 individuals and are summarized as Appendix A, which includes the statements being responded to. The evaluation team met with the FO resource specialists to discuss the RMP needs in greater detail. The new BLM Land Use Planning Handbook on page 34, section V.B.1 states that a comprehensive evaluation must address the following questions.

(1) Are actions outlined in the plan being implemented?

(2) Does the plan establish desired outcomes (i.e., goal, standards, and objectives)?

(3) Are the allocations, constraints, or mitigation measures effective in achieving (or making progress toward) the desired outcomes? This determination is often made based on information obtained from resource assessments.

(4) Have there been significant changes in the related plans of Indian tribes, State or local governments, or other Federal agencies?

(5) Are there new data or analyses that significantly affect the planning decisions or validity of the NEPA analysis?

(6) Are there unmet needs or new opportunities that can best be met through a plan amendment or revision, or will current management practices be sufficient? For example, are there outstanding requests for ACEC designations to protect resource values? Note: ACEC's must be designated through the land use planning process.

(7) Are new inventories warranted pursuant to BLM's duty to maintain inventories on a continuous basis (FLPMA, section 201)?

(8) Are there new legal or policy mandates as a result of new statues, proclamations, executive orders or court orders not addressed in the plan?

In addition to the above questions, the RMP evaluation team considered the questionnaire responses and the input from the group discussions in determining the Results and Findings below.

D. Results and Findings

Resource Management Plan

-Actions outlined in the plan are being implemented, however a number of resource specialist felt the rate of implementation was less than acceptable. Implementation is strongly influenced by funding and staffing and other priorities. Implementation is also influenced by increased interest and involvement by outside interest groups in resource management decisions. This can sometimes affect the implementation of decisions which in turn affects the Rio Puerco's management direction and taxes staff productivity. The pace at which most decisions are made (i.e., "crisis management mode") is antithetical to good planning/environmental analysis. Greater involvement of SO & WO-level staff in local decisions can results in unrealistic, arbitrary deadlines for project completion.

-The RMP is being used in decision-making. Most of the specialists felt that the actions being implemented by BLM and for the public are in conformance with the RMP. However, few EAs are being tiered to the document and little or no monitoring of projects is being done to see that they conform with stipulations in the EA and with those in the RMP.

-For the various resources in the existing plan, some of the goals, standards and objectives are not present or clearly stated. At the time the RMP was prepared, there was no supplemental program guidance to guide the preparation of the document. Some decisions, OHV designations being one of the most salient, are outdated and need to be brought into conformance with current policy. There are strong management objectives for the ACEC's, as shown in the Special Management Areas Section of the plan.

Constraints and Mitigation

-Consensus is that most allocations, constraints, or mitigation measures are effective in achieving their purpose. It appears that some of the public would like some changes in allocations and constraints and this is most evident among the residents of the community of Placitas.

-Some actions or decisions addressed in the plan have not been fully implemented including monitoring and subsequent planning. These should be carried forward in future plans.

-The stipulations and mitigation measures in the plan are being applied, however the specialists were not sure about their effectiveness, because monitoring is not always documented, and in some cases, monitoring is not occurring.

-Generally speaking, decisions are consistent with current BLM policy. The resource specialists identified some decisions that need to be revised based on new demands and public interest, including OHV designations, minerals management, land tenure adjustments, and ACECs.

Public Contact

-Most Tribal Government, State or local governments, or other Federal agencies did not have specific plans during the time period the Rio Puerco RMP was developed. Now many of these communities and local governments have land use plans, although many of them are not specific. An amendment or revised RMP needs to consider these plans within the context of current BLM policy and regulations.

At one time the public was being informed about implementation of the plan decisions through annual RMP updates and action-specific letters sent to the public who participated in the RMP development. This is no longer done since RMP updates of any kind were eliminated in the late 90s as it was felt that they served little purpose. An EA log in hard copy is kept at the front desk so that any one interested can see what projects are being implemented.

- The consensus among most resource specialists was that the District Office has a good relationship with constituencies and potential cooperating agencies.

New Data Needs

-There are new data or analyses that could significantly affect the planning decisions or validity of NEPA analysis. There are new data on population growth, including economic data, causing expansion of housing developments, demands for recreation, open space, and building materials to name a few. The population changes have brought in new people to the area and they now want a voice in planning. There is increased awareness of public ownership in the public lands.

- New inventories are warranted in a variety of programs. This is especially critical if a new RMP amendment or revision is prepared. Some areas in which inventories are needed are transportation, both roads and trials including non-motorized trails; potential ACECs including values supporting designation; mineral potential; urban interface issues, and VRM among others.

-The current RMP does not meet BLM current guidance and policy in certain program areas, including for example, land use planning (Land Use Planning Handbook was revised in March, 2005) the National Energy Policy Act of 2005, and rangeland resources (soil, air, and riparian areas), Clean Water Act requirements, environmental justice, and special status species listings

-In the early years of the plan there was considerable maintenance done using the "blue sheet" method. In 1992 the plan was reprinted and incorporated all the maintenance changes completed to that time. Since 1992, "blue sheet" maintenance changes have added, as needed, approximately a dozen maintenance changes. The plan remains useable based on the amendments and maintenance of the plan.

Resource Specific Findings

- Land tenure decisions in the RMP are not consistent with current needs and recent decisions, namely the Ojito legislation. The Ojito legislation of 2005 designated the Ojito WSA as wilderness. The bill also directed BLM to sell several thousand acres of adjacent land to the Zia Pueblo. This was contrary to the RMP decisions regarding land disposal therefore it was opposed by the FO staff. The opposition was overruled which calls into question the usefulness of any decisions in the LUP.

-Current OHV designations do not meet the new planning guidance. OHV designations should be a part of the overall transportation and travel management plan and should include trails and access. All routes must be designated open, closed or limited. If possible, i.e. if sufficient route inventory data is available to allow these decisions to be made for each route in the planning area, this should be done at the RMP level. If not in the RMP, then the process and schedule for completing travel and transportation planning after the RMP is signed must be described in the plan.

-The need for communication sites is increasing with the proliferation of the use of cell phones and other communication devices. Communication site allocation and site management stipulations need to be addressed.

- Public land-urban interface is becoming a significant issue around Albuquerque, including expanding subdivisions around towns and scattered subdivisions in predominately rural areas that abut BLM surface lands. Each of these situations present a myriad of land management challenges to deal with including split estate issues (private surface rights vs. access to federal subsurface minerals, and fire in the wildland urban interface). While many of these communities have similar types of issues such as access to public land, use of adjacent public land and so forth, others feel that their situation is unique. As a result these entities often demand the Rio Puerco FO to respond to their needs and take care of their problems, whether BLM actually has any control over these problems or not.

- Minerals management decisions need to be updated in the RMP in order to meet current demand and trends in the industry. The RMP does not address oil and gas management in the Rio Puerco watershed. The potential for future mineral development based on updated assessment and data needs to be described. Leasing stipulations need to be developed and included in the amended or revised plan. Uranium, for example, was not addressed in the current

RMP. Due to interest in possible development to the west and northwest of the planning area, management for this resource needs to be addressed in the updated plan.

Mineral material demand is also increasing. Current supplies are being depleted, and compounding this issue, adjacent residents are often opposed to active mining sites? Areas open and closed to mineral material disposal need to be identified.

- There are split estate concerns where individuals live on private surface lands over federal minerals. Exploration and development of subsurface minerals can lead to serious conflicts between the BLM and affected landowners. In conjunction with the discussion of minerals management, the split estate issue needs to be addressed in an updated RMP.

-Water rights have not been adequately addressed in the current plan because water allocations and water use permits are controlled by the State Water Engineer. BLM has no authority over the allocation of water. We need to look at what, if anything can be done differently. How much can we influence water use and rights? We need to identify those situations wherein we would apply for water rights and under what circumstances.

-There are opportunities for new management decisions and land use allocations in the following areas:

-Special Designations: several programs mentioned the need for new special designations such as ACECs to protect and conserve cultural and riparian resources. Other potential designations were identified in the 15th year evaluation of the RMP.
-Land Tenure: including identifying retention and disposal areas and avoidance and exclusion areas for routing rights-of-way.
-Transportation and Access: All roads and trails must be designated as open, limited, or closed. Currently only area designations exist.
-Visual Resource Management (VRM): visual resource inventory needs to be updated, as well as the respective needs for revised management guidelines.

-Special status species:

- Plants - existing and those with potential need to be added.
- Animals - existing and those with potential to be added; there is the potential wolf populations to move into the planning area and this should be addressed.

-Other wildlife species:

- Wildlife and game habitat, including travel corridors for species, needs to be examined.

-Vegetation Management:

- Use of fire - to control woody and noxious species invasion. Plan should conform to the New Mexico Statewide Amendment for Fire and Fuels.

- Riparian Areas- the Rio Puerco RMP was amended by the EIS for Riparian and Aquatic Habitat Management in the Albuquerque Field Office in 1999. A determination would need to be made if the management prescriptions and decisions described in that EIS are still valid.

-Wildland-Urban Interface

- Noise - consistent with Farmington policy. The Farmington Noise Policy and Protocol is described in Appendix E of the Farmington Proposed RMP/Final EIS.
- New communities are pressuring the BLM and local governments for more designated open space.
- Conflicts with BLM resource extraction activities and new, adjoining neighborhoods particularly in the Placitas area.
- New interests in using public lands such as open space, green belts, and similar undeveloped uses
- New recreation demands that often include or require some type of development to accommodate these uses. This is being driven by an expanding population and changing demographics.
  Examples of desired uses include:
  Mountain biking
  Rock climbing
  Bird watching
  Recreational shooting
  Focused areas
  Organized and competitive events
  ATVs and OHVs

While not specifically an issue, a concern of management relates to new publics who want to participate and provide input on public land use. This requires greater concern for and attention to public involvement for a variety of processes, projects and decisions.

In summary, of the above opportunities, the ones most likely to be identified as planning issues in a RMP revision or plan amendment are: travel and transportation, including OHV designations; special area designations; recreation - designating SRMAs according to new guidance in the planning handbook; minerals management; lands and realty; and wildland-urban interface.

Budget and Staffing Concerns and Recommendations

A number of staff expressed some reservations regarding the Field Office's resource capabilities to complete a plan revision or amendment:

Almost everyone interviewed expressed concern about budgeting and staffing in regard to preparing a plan amendment or a plan revision due to insufficient funding and staff. No recommendations were offered to address the situation other than to fill vacancies, which would allow for staff to work on the plan.

At least one person indicated that it would be preferable to do a plan amendment rather than a plan revision because it would be easier and faster. The rational provided was that an amendment would narrow the focus of the planning issues for the public, whereas doing a plan revision would open all resources, issues, and decisions for public comment and review, which would make the process more costly in terms of time and funding. .

Some expressed the idea that a new plan is not needed since the current one is OK. There is no funding or staff to do a new plan; therefore we need to make do with what we have.

The District Office planning lead noted that contingent on further evaluation, the current plan probably does not meet NEPA adequacy, particularly in the area of cumulative impacts. Also, due to expanding populations and changing demographics, the social and economics section does not adequately address the current situation.

Some staff felt that the following factors would heavily influence the viability and success of initiating a revised or amended plan:

1. The vastly changed and growing population will result in increased public input and complexity of user demands (e.g., wildland-urban interface issues at Placitas);
2. A growing population and the increasing number of disparate interest groups including residential homeowners, minerals industry, recreation and environmental groups are all vying for our attention which could possibly result in a more costly and time consuming planning process than we have had in the past.
3. Greater involvement of SO & WO-level staff in plan review and local decision making. This can cause problems with meeting schedules and deadlines for the preparation of an RMP, whether an amendment or a revision.
4. A shrinking workforce, which includes an increasing number of staff retirements, is resulting in a loss of knowledge, institutional memory, and experience.
5. Because of other issues and priorities that require the attention of managers, their time is often stretched rather thin which may result in lack of time for sufficient involvement in the planning process to produce a quality product.
6. The pace at which most decisions are made (i.e., "crisis management mode") is antithetical to good planning/environmental analysis;
7. The pace and the sheer workload volume of day-to-day operations, often result in poor or inadequate internal communication which has an effect on all resource management programs, not just planning.

E. Evaluation Team Recommendations

Based on the discussions with the staff, the review of the questionnaires and a review of previous evaluations, the evaluation team came up with a number of recommendations. The primary recommendation is that the Rio Puerco RMP needs to be redone either as an amendment or a complete revision. The staff has a number of concerns about having the resources, namely funding and additional staff, to do a quality job. This will be a difficult situation to deal with and while the Evaluation team provides some recommendations below, the District and Field Office management needs to begin now to strategize as to how to get the project done.

A couple of people suggested limiting the new plan to an amendment only and stay away from doing a complete revision. Their feeling was that an amendment would be less time, less work, would open less resource management scrutiny to the public, and overall would require less public involvement. This would not necessarily be the case. Because of the number of planning issues that have been identified for updating, it's likely the scope of the RMP/EIS for a plan amendment would be similar to a plan revision. A complete revision would have the advantage of looking at all programs and decisions. Those that are still valid could be brought forward and any new ones needed could be addressed. There is something to be said for having a complete and consolidated plan in one document. All plan amendments that are still valid would be incorporated. No need to go to other plans looking for certain decisions or information.

The apparent delays that could be caused by SO and WO review as mentioned above would not result in delaying the schedule or missing any deadlines. All review by the SO and WO would be built into the plan amendment or revision schedule from the start. The Planner would work with the FO to ensure that reviews by both offices are coordinated and completed in a timely manner.

However another way to approach this situation would be for the office to strategically try to initiate the plan as an amendment, but be prepared to go to a full blown revision because the number of issues, growing and changing demographics and the resulting scope of the EIS could bump the project up to a plan revision.

The following are specific recommendations to deal with developing the new or amended plan.

1. Current Plan

Continue using the current RMP in decision making and make sure that actions are in conformance with the RMP until the ROD is issued for the new plan.

Keep applying the stipulations and mitigation measures from the current RMP until the new plan is completed. After the RMP revision or amendment is completed, the Field Office should place a priority on monitoring land use health conditions. Monitoring protocols should be systematically developed, applied, and documented.

Continue the maintenance on the current plan or through amendments until the new plan or plan amendment is completed. It is acknowledged that considerable maintenance was done prior to 1992 and the FO should becommended for doing so and reprinting the plan, including the maintenance completed to that point.

2. Preparing the New Plan

Based on consideration of the number an complexity of the number of preliminarily determined issues, it is obvious that the Rio Puerso Field Office should initiate a plan revision or plan amendment no later than 2008. The evaluation team suggests that the FO should consider completing the preparation plan (pre-plan) in 2007 using base funding if at all possible. This would then allow for completing public scoping and the Analysis of the Management Situation in 2008 with add-on planning funding. This would expedite completion of the plan amendment or revision by the end or 2010 (assuming a fullyear's work each year from 2008-2010). To determine whether a plan amendment or plan revision is needed, the SO planning and NEPA coordinator and FO staff should meet to discuss issues, public interest, scope of the plan, and other considerations, and in consultation with the WO planning staff, decide which planning effort would be most appropriate.

The new plan amendment or revision needs to incorporate updated goals and more quantifiable and specific objectives, which are required in the Land Use Planning Handbook, as well as comply with the Handbook's land use plan format, content, analyses, and decision guidance. In addition the current plan does not meet standards for NEPA adequacy for cumulative impacts and socioeconomic impacts. Neither does the plan meet the standards for the arrangement and format for an RMP/EIS. Use of the current Land-Use Planning Handbook would eliminate these problems in a plan amendment of revision.

3. Potential Issues

The new plan or revision should consider the following six issues: wildland-urban interface; special designations (e.g. ACECs); travel management; land tenure; energy development (oil and gas); and minerals. During the development of the preparation plan, other identified issues or concerns should also be considered. Prior to Scoping, two strategies are recommended: 1) determine the existing plan's future amendment requirements and 2) reference Appendix C of the LUP Handbook ((Program Resource Specific Decision Guidance) to determine what should be addressed and what decisions need to be made for each resource or program.

Since the 1989 RMP was completed a number of communities and local governments have prepared land use plans of one type or another. An amended or revised RMP needs to consider these plans and be consistent with these plans to the extent allowable by BLM policy and regulation and within the context of the land use decisions of the updated Rio Puerco RMP.

The Bernalillo County management plan addresses the need for open space, green belts, etc. This could have a significant affect on BLM lands within the county. This appears to be most at issue in the Placitas area. The updated plan needs to address this area and develop management decisions in a comprehensive manner that considers land use allocation decisions from all plans that would best meet the needs of all users and neighbors.

4. Data Collection

Data gathering should start immediately. Utilizing the Data Status Table (as required in the Pre-Planning effort) is highly recommended. This will help to keep the data needs in the team's mind as they start to outline how the plan update will be completed. This should be reviewed often to make sure that data needed for alternative development and impact analysis is available when needed.

Determine which resources need additional data collected and what type of data is needed to be addressed in any new planning effort. Emphasize collection of information for potential ACECs, with special attention on the qualities that would enable the proposed area to meet the relevance and importance criteria for ACEC designaion Data collection for transportation management will also be a major undertaking.

The new plan or amendment should consider other land use plans developed by Tribal governments, State and local governments, and other Federal agencies. Staff should review plans and become knowledgeable of other's concerns/issues and build partnerships. Areas of consistency or inconsistency with other plans should be noted.

5. Implementation and Monitoring

Upon completions of the plan revision or amendment, implement a new plan implementation tracking system tied to the budget process. Use the BLM's new implementation tracking protocol. This will allow management to set priorities for project implementation.

Next Steps

2007 and 2008

- Hire or appoint a Planning Team Leader in 2007 or by 2008 at the latest. This should be a 3 year term position with the possibility of extending the position up to five years.
- Get COR and project management training
- Identify potential partners
- Plan and carry out the partnership-building series available from NTC.
- Develop the pre-plan in 2007 if possible (using current base funding) or in 2008 with add-on funding.
- It is recommended that in addition to hiring a team leader that a GIS position be

allocated exclusively to working on the RMP. This could be an inhouse position, a contracted person, or possibly a SCEP student. Most of his/her time would be required in preparation of the draft plan. Less time would be required for the proposed plan and final. The following tasks would need to be done as part of the GIS work.

Standardize data
Update data – most importantly the travel routes network
Produce maps for public meetings, documents and other uses.
Establish statements of work (SOW) for data acquisition by contractors (if needed)
Post planning data maintenance

- The following recommended core team would spend about 80% to100% of their time on preparing a new RMP, amendment or revision. A good core team can take much of the burden off other members of the tem and can schedule the work to minimize disruption to other team member's work.

  Team Leader – term position
  Dedicated GIS specialist – inhouse or contract
  Writer/editor – term or contract
  Socioeconomist – contract

- If available it is also helpful to have an environmental coordinator on the team. This person not only oversees the quality of the NEPA work but also serves as a back up to the team leader.

2008 and Beyond (assuming completing a prep plan in 2007, otherwise everything is pushed back a year.)

2008 – Complete public scoping
2008 – Complete Analysis of Management Situation
2009 – Complete Draft RMP/EIS
2009 – Complete Public review of Draft
2010 – Complete Proposed RMP/EIS
2010 – Issue Final Plan and ROD.

The above schedule is predicated on the assumption that each year would be a full year's work on the plan. A more detailed schedule would be developed in the preparation plan.

Summary Recommendation

The Rio Puerco RMP will require a major plan amendment or revision begun by FY 2008 to address rapidly changing socio-demographics, population growth, and resource uses and conditions. Given the nature of the issues that the Rio Puerco FO is dealing with and the age of

the Rio Puerco RMP, it would behoove the FO to begin the revision or amendment process as soon as possible. In order to do this the office would have to prepare the RMP preparation plan using base funding in FY 2007. Through the BPS system, one time funding should then be available in FY 2008 to continue the process through preparing the Analysis of the Management Situation, conducting scoping and beginning developing the alternatives

Allowable uses and management actions that should be considered in a plan amendment or revision include:

-Urban-wild land-fire interface issues, e.g. Placitas;
-The potential for energy development (oil and gas) in the Rio Puerco Basin that is not identified in the current plan;
-Mineral resources such as uranium and respective land use allocations;
-Needed changes in existing travel management designations (open, limited, and closed);
-Visual Resource Management (VRM) to address the amended or new land use allocations and respective management actions;
-Land retention (Lands and Realty);
-Habitat restoration; and
-T&E species.

During the evaluation, many of the interviewees recommended proceeding with a plan amendment in the near future, rather than undertaking a plan revision. However, this recommendation was driven more by the concern over the lack of available staff and resources to undertake a plan revision rather than the need for decisions to be made and complexity of the issues involved. The Field Office should consider initiating a major plan update, an amendment or revision, no later than FY 2008. Whether a plan amendment or revision is the vehicle used to update the Rio Puerco RMP, it will be a complex and involved process due to the number of emerging issues that must be addressed, the management decisions that must be made, and the amount of public interest the planning effort is likely to generate.

APPENDIX

Comment Analysis – Rio Puerco RMP Evaluation – General Questions

Question	Yes	No	Don't Know	Comments
1. Are management actions outlined in the plan being implemented? If not do you know why?	6			-Influenced by funding and staff and other priorities. -ACEC plans have been written.
2. Does the plan clearly establish desired outcomes (i.e., goal, standards, and objectives)?	6			-Some decisions, OHV, are becoming outdated. -Outcomes identified mostly in activity plans. -RMP is general in nature, but some outcomes addressed; most identified in activity plans. -"Control of erosion and sediment production from public lands remains a high priority management goal."
3. Are the allocations, constraints, or mitigation measures effective in achieving (or making progress toward achieving) the desired outcomes?	5		1	-Some new restraints needed. -Some, probably few. -Some minerals and realty decisions made at higher level and plan decisions are disregarded. -Program is effective
4. Have there been significant changes in the related plans of Indian tribes, State or local governments, or other Federal agencies? If so, is the RMP consistent with these changes?	1	1	5	-Some changes; most are consistent.
5. Are there new data or analyses that significantly affect the planning decisions or validity of the NEPA analysis?	2	1	3	-Urban interface issues; new critical elements such as migratory birds. -Cumulative impacts for realty, recreation, minerals; urban interface impacts need to be addressed. -No funding or emphasis on collecting new data.
6. Are there unmet needs or new opportunities	4	1	1	-Urban interface issues; one new ACEC suggested.

that can best be met through a plan amendment or revision, or will current management practices be sufficient? For example, are there outstanding requests for ACEC designations to protect resource values?				-Noxious weeds and addressing situation in #5. -New ACECs and the issues with Placitas.
7. Are new inventories warranted pursuant to BLM's duty to maintain inventories on a continuous basis (FLPMA, section 201)? Do you think these new inventories would change any land use or allocation decisions in the plan?	4	1	1	-Road inventory needed. -Some inventories needed; some allocation changes needed. -Everything related to urban interface needs to be examined. -Very few inventories are done to begin with.
8. Are there new legal or policy mandates as a result of new statues, proclamations, executive orders or court orders not addressed in the plan?	4	2		-Some -Noxious weeds and neo-tropical birds. -Plan written years ago but we can't apply new guidance without rewriting plan.
9. The Rio Puerco RMP has run its theoretical life of 20 years. Are there actions or decisions addressed in the plan that have not yet been implemented? If so, should these be dropped or carried forward into a revised or amended plan?	4		1	-Some dropped; some carried forward. -All decisions except those supplanted by other plans have been implemented to some degree. -Much of monitoring and subsequent planning called for has not been done. Incorporate in future plans pending funding and resources made available. -Some studies and research and watershed plans may no longer be needed. -Acquisitions in Elk Springs area have not been completed. --Carry this decision forward.
10. Do Field and District office budget request and AWP allocations promote the implementation of the RMP?	4	1	1	-Budget requests reflect; allocations sometime made to other priority. -Budget requests do, allocations don't.
11. Is the RMP regularly considered in preparing EAs, activity plans, and in decision making including the application of stipulations and mitigations?	6			-Always conformance check. - Often linked to desired outcomes (question #2).
12. Are actions being implemented by BLM (internal) and for the public (external) in conformance with the	4	2	1	-Conformation always based on plan interpretations of plan intentions.

RMP? Are you aware of any actions that have been implemented that were not consistent with the RMP or any amendment?				
13. Has monitoring prescribed in the RMP been implemented or is continuing to be implemented?	4	1	1	-Depends to large extent on time allowance. -Some being done but little systematic documentation. -As time and staffing levels will allow. -Little emphasis on monitoring - lack of staff and funding. -Some eliminated because of limited time cooperative basis. - Some replaced by qualitative Land Health Assessments and Riparian Functional Assessment.
14. Are maintenance changes being documented in the RMP so as to keep it up to date? (Maintenance changes are those minor data changes that do not change an RMP decision or allocation.)	2	1	3	-Could do better. -Not taking time to do them. -Not recently. (2)
Totals	56	11	18	**Number of Respondents –6**